REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The drawings are objected to because "vector" is misspelled in FIG. 4, step 402. As such, Applicants herewith submit a replacement FIG. 4 to correct the typographical error. Further, a replacement sheet for FIG. 8 is also submitted to correct other typographical errors.

Claims 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement for containing subject matter which was not described in the specification. Specifically, the Examiner states that the term "attempting" was neither mentioned nor described in the specification. Applicants disagree and point to page 8, lines 17-21 where the specification states "the receiving device 102 *attempts* to decrypt at least a portion of the next packet ..." [emphasis added].

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 for failing to comply with the enablement requirement for containing subject matter which was not described in the specification. Specifically, the Examiner states that the term "a priori" was neither mentioned nor described in the specification and renders the claim ambiguous and unclear. Applicants' have amended Claim 13 to coincide with the language found in the specification on page 5, lines 15-16.

The Examiner has stated that the claims as filed are drawn to the following inventions: Group I - Claim 1-14, drawn to providing encryption in a communication system using encryption vectors and also ensuring the receipt of packets by use of acknowledgements, classified in class 380, subclass 277, and Group II - Claim 15-16, drawn to carrier sense circuitry, demodulators, and decoders coupled to a processor, classified in class 375, subclass 147. As mentioned in the telephone call on 14 February 2006, Applicants which to prosecute Group I. As such, Claims 15-16 are withdrawn from the application.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srivastava (U.S. Patent No. 6,684,331, also termed "Reference 1") in view of Lynn (U.S. Patent No. 5,345,508, also termed "Reference 2").

In response, Applicants have amended the claims to more clearly specify the invention. As such, each claim has been amended to clarify that the packets mentioned in the claims are physical layer packets operating at layer 1. As noted in the background, the prior art has been focused on wireless local area network security at layer two ("L2") and above. Specification, background, page 1. Similarly, the cited art, References 1 and 2 describe security at a layer 2 or Medium Access Layer. In contrast, Applicants' invention requires that the security take place at layer 1 or the physical layer.

Specifically, each claim has been amended to specify that encrypted physical layer packets are transmitted and that the encrypted physical layer packets are encrypted using encryption vectors. The amendment is supported completely by the specification since every reference to packets is preceded by the phrase "**PHY**" referring to a physical layer packet. Further, transmitting encrypted physical layer packets is not at all described or suggested by any of the prior art references, either singularly or combined. As such, Applicants believe that the claims, as amended, overcome the cited art and that the claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

By: ___/Indira Saladi/_____

Motorola, Inc.
1303 East Algonquin Road
IL01/3rd Floor
Schaumburg, IL 60196
Customer Number:

Indira Saladi
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 45,579

Telephone: 847-576-6735
Fax No.: 847-576-0721